

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 17, 2006, the examiner rejected applicants' claims 1-29, 31 and 33-34 for alleged anticipation or obviousness in view of several cited references. Claims 14 and 26-34 were further rejected for alleged indefiniteness under 35 USC 112. Notwithstanding these rejections, claims 30 and 32 were indicated to recite allowable subject matter "if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 ... and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims" (Office Action, p. 7, para. 8).

In response, applicant has rewritten independent claim 26 to incorporate the limitations from related and now-canceled dependent claim 30. In addition, the preamble clause of claim 26 has been revised in a manner which is believed to clearly and definitively recite the "astragal boot" in combination with the preamble-recited structures.

Since the examiner identified the presence of allowable subject matter in now-canceled dependent claim 30, independent claim 26 as now presented is respectfully believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 27-29 and 31-34 remain in this application, and add further limitations to parent claim 26. The preamble phrase of each of these dependent claims has been revised to recite "[t]he combination", as suggested by the examiner (Office Action, p. 3). These dependent claims 27-29 and 31-34 are submitted for allowance with parent claim 26.

New independent claim 35 corresponds with as-filed claim 32, rewritten in independent form and with the preamble clause revised to recite the "astragal boot" in combination with the preamble-recited structures. Since the examiner identified the presence of allowable subject matter in as-filed dependent claim 32, new independent claim 35 as now presented is also respectfully believed to be in proper condition for allowance.


Claims 36-42 are new dependent claims adding further limitations to parent claim 35. These new dependent claims correspond respectively with as-filed dependent claims 27-31 and 33-34, but wherein the preamble phrase of each of these dependent claims recites "[t]he combination" – again as suggested by the examiner in the Office Action. Accordingly, these new dependent claims 36-42 are submitted for allowance with parent claim 35.

Conclusion

In conclusion, in view of the foregoing claims revisions and newly added claims, applicants respectfully submit that claims 26-29 and 31-42 as now presented in this application are in proper form for reconsideration and allowance. A formal Notice of Allowance is believed to be in order, and is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KELLY LOWRY & KELLEY, LLP


Stuart O. Lowry
Registration No. 26,563

SOL:cw
6320 Canoga Avenue, Suite 1650
Woodland Hills, California 91367
(818) 347-7900